

REMARKS

The previous rejection of claims 1-7 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Moore et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,775), and the rejection of claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. has been maintained and made final. Applicants traverse. The Examiner's response to the previous remarks will be addressed.

The Examiner likens the pitch sections of Moore to the abutting first and second axial pieces claimed. The explicit claim language and ordinary meaning of the terms used in the claim preclude such an interpretation.

Merriam Webster's Online Dictionary defines "abut" as 1) to touch along a border or with a projecting part (land abuts on the road) and 2a) to terminate at a point of contact. Applicants submit that the term "abut" within the context of claim 1 inherently describes the first and second axial pieces as terminating at a point of contact or touching along a border, neither of which are implicitly or explicitly provided by Moore et al.

The "sections" of Moore et al. are not synonymous or analogous to the claimed "axial pieces," and the sections therefore fail to "abut one another" because there are no discrete pieces that have a point of termination of borders. Instead, the core plug 14 of Moore et al. is continuous and unitary, and the sections accordingly are non-discrete, having no defined borders therebetween.

Nor is it reasonable to read the recited feature (“a core plug having a first axial piece and a second axial piece that abut one another...”) into Moore et al. insofar as Moore et al. do not even address the problem of radiator distortion during assembly. Accordingly, Moore et al. fail to disclose or suggest the invention as recited in claim 1.

As in the previous Office Action, the Examiner fails to provide a *prima facie* basis for the rejection of claims 16-31, and instead merely states that “claims 16-23 are similar in scope to claims 1-15; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason,” and “claims 24-31 are similar in scope to claims 1-15; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason.” Accordingly, Applicants are still left without guidance as to the basis of the Examiner’s rejections of these claims, and submit that Moore et al. fail to anticipate or render obvious claims 16-31.

Claims 16 and 31 recite means-plus-function elements of a multiple bandwidth antenna where the “core means [have] at least two pieces” and either “coupling means having a predetermined helical pitch for removably coupling said at least two pieces to one another” or “a helical radiator ...for removably coupling said at least two pieces to one another.” Therefore, 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph, requires that the Examiner construe the elements to “cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof.” Turning to the specification, it is clear that, among other things, “the core plug is severable into a plurality of separate pieces” and as such, that “the multiple pitch helical radiator may advantageously be pre-formed to have a general predetermined pitch or

plurality of pitches, into which the respective core plug pieces are then assembled.” (page 4, lines 29-32). Clearly, the unitary core plug 14 of Moore et al. is not severable into a plurality of separate pieces that are assembled into a pre-formed radiator.

Claims 24 and 30 are patentable over Moore et al. for at least similar reasons. Claims 24 and 30 recite a method for assembling a multiple bandwidth antenna that include, *inter alia*, assembling or coupling a first core plug piece or portion to a second core plug piece or portion following formation of first and second plug pieces or portions. Clearly, a unitary core plug 14 such as that disclosed by Moore et al. cannot have first and second pieces that are coupled to one another after formation.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite the prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Brittany C. MacDonald
Registration No. 44,159

February 23, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315
Customer No. 24978